

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

XIU FANG LUO,

Plaintiff,

No. C 08-0340 PJH

v.

**ORDER TO SHOW  
CAUSE**

MICHAEL CHERTOFF, Secretary,  
Department of Homeland Security, et al.,

Defendants.

/

Before the court is defendants' objection to and request for reconsideration of the court's order granting attorney Bruce C. Wong's application for admission of attorney *pro hac vice*. The application filed by Mr. Wong, on its face, meets the requirements of Civil Local Rule 11-3(a), in that he certifies that he is an active member in good standing of the state of Washington, that he agrees to abide by the Standards of Professional Conduct set forth in Rule 11-4, and that an attorney who maintains an office in California and is a member of the bar of this court, has been designated as co-counsel.

Defendants, however, contend that the application was made in violation of Rule 11-3(b), which disqualifies applicants who reside in the state of California and those who are regularly engaged in the practice of law in the state of California. In support of their contentions, they assert that Mr. Wong's place of business is in San Francisco, which suggests that he resides in California, and that he has recently appeared as counsel in four other cases filed in this district, which suggests that he is regularly engaged in the practice of law in California. They do not address whether any of the exceptions to the disqualification standard might be available to Mr. Wong.

The court finds that the objections raised by defendants are, at a minimum, sufficient

1 to raise questions about Mr. Wong's eligibility for *pro hac vice* status. Accordingly, Mr.  
2 Wong is hereby ORDERED to show cause why the court's January 30, 2008 order granting  
3 *pro hac vice* status should not be vacated. To that end, Mr. Wong is granted until  
4 **February 15, 2008**, to respond to defendants' objections in writing. Defendants shall have  
5 until **February 22, 2008**, to reply. Thereafter, the matter will be submitted and the court will  
6 issue a written order.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: February 5 2008



9  
10 PHYLIS J. HAMILTON  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28